

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated June 22, 2006, claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11 and 14-16 are amended. Claims 1-16 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

The as indication that claims 6, 12 and 14 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form is acknowledged and appreciated.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

Claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 14-16 have been objected to for having minor informalities.

By this response, each of claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 14-16 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. Consequently, withdrawal of the objection to claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 14-16 is respectfully solicited.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

I. Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gatti et al. (EP 801 514).

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants wish to point out that the Examiner has apparently misread independent claim 1. It is clear from Figs. 5 and 6, for example, that the image display device comprises a main display body and a stand for supporting the main display body. The main display body is labeled "1" in Figs. 5 and 6 and also denoted as such on page 11, lines 11-20 of the specification. According to independent claim 1, the main display body is provided with (i) a display portion for presenting an image, (ii) a first loudspeaker for reproducing sounds of low frequency, (iii) a second pair of loudspeakers for

reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies, and (iv) a duct for improving a low frequency sound property of the first loudspeaker. The stand, which is separate from the main display body, supports the main display body and has a portion that is opposite to an outlet of the duct.

The Examiner identifies video unit 11 of Gatti et al. as the main display body and support base 10 as the stand. However, in Gatti et al., it is the support base 10 (stand), not video unit 11, that is provided with a first loudspeaker for reproducing sounds of low frequency, a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies, and a duct for improving a low frequency sound property of the first loudspeaker. Therefore, what is recited in independent claim 1 is different from what is disclosed in Gatti et al.

To assure that the Examiner does not misread independent claim 1, it has been amended to include an “**and**” between “a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies” and “a duct for improving a low frequency sound property of the first loudspeaker”.

In view of the above, independent claim 1, and claim 3 depending from independent claim 1, are patentable over Gatti et al. and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

II. Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatti et al. in view of Shiota et al. (USPN 5,825,903) and Hodsdon et al. (USPN 3,989,909).

The rejections of claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 13 are respectfully traversed.

As claims 2 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and Shiota et al. and Hodsdon et al. do not remedy the above-noted deficiency of Gatti et al., claims 2 and 10 are patentable over Gatti et al. also, even when considered in view of Shiota et al. and Hodsdon et al. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2 and 10 is respectfully solicited.

As to independent claim 5, Applicants wish to point out that the Examiner has apparently misread independent claim 5 in the same manner as independent claim 1.

The Examiner identifies video unit 11 of Gatti et al. as the main display body, support base 10 as the stand and support 13 as the housing having the first loudspeaker and the second pair of loudspeakers. According to Gatti et al., support 13 is part of support base 10 (stand). However, the image display device of independent claim 5 comprises a main display body and a stand, separate from the main display body, for supporting the main display body. The main display body further includes a display portion for presenting an image and a housing that includes (i) a first loudspeaker for reproducing sounds of low frequency, (ii) a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies, and (iii) a duct for improving a low frequency sound property.

However, as noted above, in Gatti et al., it is the support base 10, not video unit 11, that is provided with a first loudspeaker for reproducing sounds of low frequency, a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies, and a duct for improving a low frequency sound property of the first loudspeaker. Therefore, what is recited in independent claim 5 is different from what is disclosed in Gatti et al.

To assure that the Examiner does not misread independent claim 5, it has been amended to include an “**and**” between “a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies” and “a duct for improving a low frequency sound property of the first loudspeaker” and “a housing” has been moved so that it is clear that it is part of the main display body and includes (i) a first loudspeaker for reproducing sounds of low frequency, (ii) a second pair of loudspeakers for reproducing sounds of middle and high frequencies, and (iii) a duct for improving a low frequency sound property.

Neither Shiota et al. nor Hodsdon et al. remedy the above-noted deficiency regarding Gatti et al. Therefore, independent claim 5, and claims 7, 8 and 13 depending from independent claim 5, are patentable over Gatti et al., Shiota et al. and Hodsdon et al., considered alone or in combination. Consequently, the allowance of claims 5, 7, 8 and 13, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

III. Claims 4, 9, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatti et al. in view of Shiota et al. and Hodsdon et al., and further in view of Hayashi (JP 4-4493).

However, as claims 4 and 11 depend indirectly from amended independent claim 1, and claims 9, 15 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 5, they are patentable over Gatti et al., Shiota et al. and Hodsdon et al., considered alone or in combination, and even when considered further in view Hayashi.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees


Application No. 10/506,782
Amendment dated February 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2006

Docket No.: 1907-0217PUS1

required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant